

North Salem Planning Board Minutes

December 2, 2009

7:30 PM – Annex

PRESENT: **Cynthia Curtis, Chairwoman**
 Robert Tompkins, Board Member
 Bernard Sweeney, Board Member
 Gary Jacobi, Board Member
 Roland A. Baroni, Town Attorney
 Sonja Teichmann, Planning Consultant

ABSENT: **Charlotte Harris, Board Member**

ATTENDANTS:	Paul Properties:	Rod Burgess
		Andy Hubbard
	Dubin:	Jeri Barrett
		Don Rossi, Esq.
		Steve Coleman
		Bill Beckman
		Brenda Ames
	Baxter Road:	Dave McAdoo

Chairwoman Cynthia Curtis calls the December 2, 2009 North Salem Planning Board Meeting to order.

PUBLIC HEARING:

- 1. Paul Properties:** Rod Burgess (owner – various – Verni, Paul Properties)
Chapter 189 Tree Cutting Permit (location – Hardscrabble Road)

Open Public Hearing Regarding Chapter 189 Tree Cutting Permit.

Cynthia opens the Public Hearing and confirms the Green Cards have been handed in and the Public Hearing Notice published in the Journal News. Cynthia confirms that there have been no written comments other than the letter from Dr. Klemens. Cynthia states that Rod Burgess, the Applicant is here tonight, as well as Andy Hubbard who is a representative from the Westchester Agricultural Council (WAC), who will be overseeing part of this project. Cynthia states the property is on the North side of Hardscrabble Road. Approximately 150 acres of the 263 acre parcel will be harvested. We understand from the Applicant that approximately 16 trees per acre will be removed. This is a parcel that is heavily wooded. It has on average 30, fourteen-inch or larger trees per acre. We have recognized that the activity is excluded under the local Freshwater Wetlands Ordinance. It is also an exempt action under our local Stormwater Ordinance with the exception of the landing areas and log haul roads that are subject to certain performance and design criteria. The Planning Board made a Site Visit on November 1st with our Planning Consultant, a member of the Town Board, and Dr. Klemens who is doing a Biodiversity Study of the area. Most of the work is being done under the auspices and guidance of the WAC in accordance with a technical guidelines prepared for vernal pool protection. There are at least four vernal pools on this property.

Cynthia asks the audience if anyone has any questions. They do not. Cynthia asks the Board if they have any questions. They do not. Cynthia states that one neighbor came in to look at the file, and all of her questions were answered. Cynthia states that if there are no further comments or questions she will close the Public Hearing.

REGULAR MEETING:

2. **Paul Properties:** Rod Burgess (owner – various – Verni, Paul Properties)
Chapter 189 Tree Cutting Permit (location – Hardscrabble Road)

Consider Draft Resolution of Negative Declaration and Approval Regarding Chapter 189 Tree Cutting Permit (With Conditions).

Cynthia states since there are no new comments to add, the Board has a Draft Resolution of Approval to consider tonight. This is the first time the Board and Applicant are seeing the Draft Resolution. It will be important to take time and go through it. Cynthia has added a lot of information about potential inspections of the property. Cynthia did meet yesterday with the Building Inspector, as this is only the second timber harvesting project in Town. Cynthia states that we will all go through the Draft Resolution together. Gary feels that the Board may just read it themselves. Cynthia states Page 1 lays out the order of review, and is continued on the Page 2. Page 1 talks about our SEQR review which is pretty straight forward based on the materials received. Cynthia confirms the language under ND1 on Page 3 with Mr. Hubbard. On Page 4 at the top, Mr. Burgess confirms the duration of anticipated tree harvesting should be changed to 3 to 5 months instead of 3 months total. Bernard asks when the project will start. Mr. Burgess states this month if possible. Bernard discusses the hours of operation listed in ND5 on Page 4, especially the closing time being 6:00 p.m. Mr. Burgess states the operators are there until 3:00 p.m., it is possible that a log truck may come in a little later. Mr. Burgess states that it gets dark around 4:30 p.m. or 5:00 p.m. The closing time is a catch-all that we use for summer and winter hours. Cynthia asks if Mr. Burgess anticipates work being done every Saturday. Mr. Burgess states that they rarely work every Saturday. Cynthia states that is good to hear as that was a question from one of the neighbors. Cynthia states that the language at the bottom of Page 4 is standard. Referring to Pages 5 and 6 there is a listing of items that must be done prior to the commencement of any site work. Cynthia states that the Board understands the Applicant will put all of the soil and erosion control measures in place and then have a preconstruction meeting. Cynthia asks Mr. Burgess if the preconstruction meeting may be held after all of the soil and erosion control measures are in place so when the Building Inspector goes out there he may do two things at once. Mr. Burgess states that there is a misunderstanding. All of the erosion control measures are not put in at the beginning of the job. The water bars for example are put in at the end of the job. The only erosion control measures set up initially would be the crossings. Those would pertain to the bridges. Cynthia states we have to clarify that. Sonja inquires about any needed silt fencing. Mr. Burgess states that the crossings and bridges will be set up with silt fencing, and then the project will proceed. Erosion control measures such as hay and seed will be done at the end of the job. Cynthia confirms with Mr. Hubbard this process will fall under his inspection. Gary states that it seems like an awful long time to pass, if trees are proposed to be cut the beginning of December, and the project not complete until May. Mr. Burgess states that only one man, possibly two will be working in there to do the tree cutting and skidding. There will not be a crew in there. It is a one-man show with a slow process.

Cynthia states that the Building Inspector has asked for a schedule of the work so he has a better understanding as to when he should visit the site to make his inspections. Cynthia states that we should concentrate on the soil and erosion control and what happens when, so that the Building Inspector can figure out at what key points he would either go out to the site or send the Wetlands Inspector. Cynthia asks Mr. Burgess or Mr. Hubbard if they would submit a separate schedule of work as well as the installation of the controls. Mr. Burgess states that they could, except monitoring should take place every two days or once or twice a week. Once the job begins everything falls into place. Mr. Burgess talks about the set up for the vernal pools, as far as cutting around each one and then having an inspection. That might create a bottleneck in terms of how to coordinate this process. Cynthia states that the Building Inspector wants to be out on the site at a point in time when he could clearly see the area has been marked, so he understands where the vernal

pools are located. Once the process has started in that area, he wanted to have someone there to see that the process is being handled correctly. His intention was not to have work done in one area, have the job stop, and wait for an inspection. The Building Inspector wanted to understand what the schedule would be, so that he could visit the site, and have a comfort level that the person working at the site is following the guidelines that have been set up. Mr. Burgess states that is fine, when the crossings are set up, we will call the Building Inspector for an inspection. Cynthia requests the language be written in a generic way so that Mr. Burgess and the Building Inspector may sit down and have an agreed upon schedule of how the operation will take place, and when to schedule the inspections. Mr. Burgess agrees. Cynthia states the key points the Building Inspector wanted to see would be for everyone to understand where the vernal pools are, a quick check to make sure the process is being done the way it has been proposed, and then a final inspection with a final report. Mr. Burgess refers to the vernal pools discussed on the Site Walk and states he will point those four areas out on the Map. There is a discussion about the wetlands around the vernal pools having flags that are old. The Applicant will re-flag those areas. Cynthia asks Sonja to rewrite that paragraph. Sonja inquires about the timeframe. Cynthia states since this is prior to the commencement of work, we have to state that there must be a preconstruction meeting with the Building Inspector to establish the construction inspection schedule. Cynthia states that one or two of the inspections will involve the Wetlands Inspector.

Gary asks why the silt fencing and hay bails are not installed earlier or along the way. Mr. Hubbard states that the silt fencing and hay bails may be installed along the crossings. On the skid trail roads, the silt fencing and hay bails would be run over. Gary asks if they could be installed along the side. Mr. Hubbard states that there would be no point to install silt fencing and hay bails along the side. If there was erosion going along the side of the skid trail, then silt fencing and hay bails would be installed, typically with an operation in progress, that would not be the case. Mr. Burgess states that the control measures are designated for the drainage of the crossing of the skid roads. Mr. Burgess states that the idea is to keep the water off the road quickly. Mr. Burgess states that at the end of the job the water bars are installed along with the seed and hay bails. Sonja states this could be discussed during the initial Site Walk with the Building Inspector and Wetlands Inspector so that areas of concern are pointed out in time for mitigation to take place.

Referring to Page 6, Item C(13), Cynthia states that we could re-word this to state that we anticipate an initial and periodic inspection of the vernal pool area, as agreed upon at the preconstruction meeting with the Building Inspector. We won't be specific, we will state generically that there will be a pre-inspection and one vernal pool inspection.

Cynthia states those are the only questions she had, and asks the Board if they have anything further.

Referring to Page 6, Item C(14), Gary would like to know who the SMO is. Cynthia confirms that would be the Stormwater Management Officer, Bruce Thompson.

Mr. Hubbard refers to Page 1, paragraph 3, and states that the word "oak" should be added in with the specific trees listed.

Mr. Hubbard states that it his understanding of the stormwater regulations is that the haul roads and log landings are also exempt, not just the skid trails. That is stated pretty clearly. Cynthia states this is the way that our regulation is written. Mr. Hubbard states that there is no exemption written in the Town of North Salem's Stormwater Code for haul roads and log landings. Cynthia states the activity is exempt with this exception is the way our local law is written.

Gary refers to Page 7 regarding the Approval expiring 180 days unless the above conditions have been satisfied and asks why are we giving the Applicant 180 days of potentially operating in violation. Cynthia states the Applicant has 180 days to start the work before the permit expires. Gary states there is nothing in

this Draft Resolution that states when the Applicant has to be finished with the work. There is a discussion regarding the deadline for finishing the work. Mr. Burgess states that due to weather conditions we may have to stop a job and return during the summer. Mr. Burgess requests the Approval be for one year. After discussion the decision is to have the Approval expire one year from the date of this Resolution, with two six month extensions available upon request in writing from the Applicant. Cynthia states that she has more of a concern about the site being stabilized if the job has to be stopped due to weather conditions. Cynthia states that we had discussed the areas near the vernal pools be completed first. We should build that into the scheduling paragraph. Mr. Hubbard states he suggests the work to be done near the vernal pools when the ground conditions are the best, i.e., dry and frozen.

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Adopt the SEQR Negative Declaration (Type I Action) and Chapter 189 Tree Removal Permit Resolution of Approval, With Modifications, for Paul Properties, Inc. Bernard Sweeney seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

3. **Dubin:** Jeri Barrett (owner – Dubin Properties)
Wetlands Permit (location – 12 & 14 June Road)

Discuss status of DEC Permit and dredging of Pond 1; Review Stormwater Permit Requirements.

Don Rossi states that the Conservation Easement has been Approved to be Amended. It has not been executed yet. Cynthia asks Mr. Rossi to remind the Planning Board what the minor amendment to the Conservation Easement was that they went before the Town Board for. Mr. Rossi states that there had been a Lot Line Change between the Dubin's and the Savino's. The boundary extended on different tax lots. We had to amend the whereas clause.

Mr. Rossi states that as far as the Wetlands Permit, we are hopeful to be able to proceed. Mr. Rossi states that e-mails have gone back and forth regarding the bad condition of the main bridge. Mr. Rossi states that is a concern. Mr. Rossi states that the latest report from Joe Bridges suggests testing the bridge to see how sturdy it might be. Mr. Rossi states that the bridge is in a state where it could collapse. We would like to remove it on an emergency basis, so that there will not be additional disturbance in the controlled area then otherwise would occur. Cynthia states that we have a report from Insite Engineering which states the bridge is unsafe. From reading the report, Cynthia did not get the impression the bridge is about to collapse. Cynthia states she called the Building Inspector and asked him to go out and inspect the bridge, so he may advise the Planning Board as to whether or not this is an emergency situation. Cynthia spoke with the Building Inspector to see if he would rather have the Town Engineer take a look. Cynthia states that the Planning Board needs someone from the Town to go out before they may decide whether or not this is an emergency situation. Roland agrees with Cynthia. The Building Inspector did not feel qualified to make that decision. He contacted the Town Engineer and asked him to go out to confirm whether or not the bridge is ready to collapse. Mr. Rossi states for practical purposes that he does not understand why they may not remove it. It is going to come down and it needs to come down. Cynthia asks Mr. Rossi if he is proposing to remove the bridge without rebuilding another at this point. Mr. Rossi states that they are proposing to remove the bridge and rebuild a new one. Mr. Rossi states that he believes this may be done without obtaining any approvals. Mr. Rossi states that his client is anxious. Cynthia states that it is not a bridge that provides access to the property. Roland states that the Applicant will need a Wetlands Permit in order to replace the bridge. Mr. Rossi states that in an emergency situation we should be able to replace it. Cynthia states that the bridge is not a necessity. The bridge does not provide access to the house. It is for recreation, and for crossing water. Sonja mentions alternatives. Mr. Rossi states that it is not a question of alternatives. The landowner does not have to deal with alternatives on SEQR. Mr. Rossi states that there has been a common thread through many of the comments. We are not here to have someone tell us what their opinion is or what the alternatives are on the site. We have a specific task under the Wetlands Ordinance, and that is to show that the proposed work that

the landowner would like to do for whatever reason is not going to have an adverse impact on wetlands in a controlled area. That is the basis of our permit application. This bridge is an integral part of the property. It is an integral part of the network of trails for horseback riding purposes, which is a common thread throughout the Town. Mr. Rossi states that he does not have to show that there are alternatives. Mr. Rossi, as well as the Applicant perceives this to be a safety problem. We have equipment to go in to remove the bridge and on foundations which would be designed for the new bridge, install a newly manufactured pre-fabricated bridge. Cynthia states that work needs to be done to the foundation. It is not a matter of removing one bridge and replacing it with another. Mr. Rossi states that is right. We would like to do all of that at the same time. Cynthia states that work will be done in the wetlands area. Roland states a Permit is required. Roland asks Mr. Rossi if he is trying to say that he should be allowed to do the work before obtaining a Permit. Mr. Rossi states that if they address this situation as an emergency, they should be able to go in and take the bridge down and replace it. Cynthia asks Don what the emergency is requiring the immediate need for a replacement. Mr. Rossi states that there is a lot of work to do in connection with this project, including the utilization of equipment to remove the bridge. While the equipment is there, there is work to be done. Cynthia states that makes perfect sense, but the argument that the replacement of the bridge is an emergency situation is just not there. Clearly the Board understands the need for the bridge to be removed, which could be backed up by the Town Engineer after he goes out and confirms that it may fall down, and should be removed. Cynthia states the Board is having difficulties with a request to construct another bridge before the Application is finished. Cynthia states that if the bridge were the only access to the house, the Board could not deny access. Cynthia states that if the Applicant had proposed to do all of the bridges this would have been an easier application. Cynthia states that the hard part about this Application will be the dredge work that is proposed. Mr. Rossi would like the Town Engineer to take a look at the bridge. Gary states that he has no problem with the removal of the bridge without the involvement of the Town Engineer. Cynthia states that the letter from Insite Engineering states that the bridge is unsafe to use. It does not state that the bridge is ready to fall down. Cynthia asks Mr. Rossi if the bridge may be taken out without any wetland or controlled area disturbance. Mr. Barrett states that we have provided an impact analysis. They have demonstrated and tried to put forth in their recent submittal to the Board that a minor disturbance would take place in order to remove and replace the bridge. We will install erosion controls. The bridge will be taken out. The footings will have a minor modification. To further ensure that there will be no problem with sedimentation going into the pond, we will lower the level of the pond. Therefore if for some reason the erosion controls did fail and we did have sedimentation in the pond, it would be trapped and not wash out into the State Wetlands. We provided that information to the Board so that they could make an informed decision.

Cynthia states that Joe Bridges could not be here tonight to respond directly. Sonja states Joe has a concern that the energy sources for the pumps that would be used to lower the level of the water in the pond is not fully sufficient. Joe is worried that if one of the pumps or generator fails, the increased turbidity would cause damage. If the water level is high, the turbidity would be spread out, whereas if the water level is low, the impact would be more intense. Mr. Barrett states that Bill Beckman, Civil Engineer for the project is here tonight. Mr. Beckman talks about lowering the water level and installing the turbidity curtains across the pond in case it fills up. Mr. Barrett states that they did try to address this issue. Sonja states their memo had language regarding the water quality, and whether there is an actual need for the pond to be dredged.

Cynthia asks if a DEC Permit is required in order to perform the bridge work. Mr. Barrett states he has not heard back from Heather Gierloff at the DEC in terms of a written response. Mr. Barrett states that the property owners are looking at this as an emergency situation. Mr. Barrett states he hopes to convince the Board and DEC that this is an emergency situation. Cynthia asks Roland if the Board agreed this is an emergency, would the Applicant have to go through the wetland process? Roland asks if there is an exemption or a waiver provision in the Wetlands Law for emergencies. Cynthia believes there is. It may be up to the Building Inspector to decide that it is an emergency. Roland states that some criteria would be needed. At most, it could be the bridge falling in the water. Cynthia states that if the Board agrees that this is

not an emergency, they may not take action on one part of an Application and accelerate it. Mr. Rossi does not believe there is any provision in the Wetlands Law for emergency work. Mr. Rossi states this is a very common for there to be an emergency provision in regulatory statutes. Mr. Rossi states that it is more than the bridge collapsing. It could collapse with a horse and rider on it, or a child on it.

Gary asks why we are talking about the pond dredging and the bridge in the same time period. Mr. Rossi states that they are trying not to. They hope to remove this particular bridge and separate it out from the rest of the project. Cynthia states that if the Applicant just wanted to remove the bridge, she does not believe that would be a problem. The Applicant is talking about isolating the bridge and doing a bridge project. Mr. Rossi states that they would at least like to remove the bridge. The Board agrees that the Applicant may remove the bridge.

There is discussion about there being no need to dredge the pond in order to replace the bridge. Cynthia states that both cases have the potential for turbidity. Cynthia states that the Board may not isolate one part of the project. That would be segmentation. Cynthia states under New York State DEC Law, in the Quality Review Act, the project may not be segmented. Sonja states that both actions have to be looked at. Cynthia states an option may be for an Application to be submitted just for the bridge work. Mr. Rossi states that is a classic interpretation of the prohibition against segmentation. Mr. Rossi states that in his opinion, his client may restore one bridge and may not ever go forward with the dredging. Mr. Rossi states that the replacement of the bridge does not depend on the dredging. Cynthia states that hopefully the bridge is boarded off so no one will cross over it. Gary asks Mr. Rossi if the bridge is boarded off. Mr. Rossi does not know.

There is a discussion whether a SWPPP will be needed depending on the amount of the disturbance. Cynthia talks about the memo from the Town Engineer and asks how long it would take for the Applicant to put together a SWPPP. Mr. Barrett states that there are no impervious surfaces. We should be able to get a SWPPP together quickly, as a lot of the leg work has already been done. Mr. Rossi asks if the Board is referring to a DEC SWPPP or a Town SWPPP. Cynthia states both, as everything needs to be done at the same time. Mr. Rossi believes they meet the exemption criteria for the Town SWPPP due to the fact that we are proposing routine maintenance work in order to dredge the pond. Cynthia asks Mr. Rossi if he is proposing to take dredged material from the pond, deposit it somewhere else, and not change the grade. Mr. Barrett states that the material will be stockpiled and used somewhere else on the farm. The necessity of dredging the ponds is discussed. Mr. Bridges does not see the necessity and has stated this in his memo. Cynthia asks Mr. Barrett if the DEC has responded and if they will provide a dredging permit. Mr. Barrett states that they have not responded. Mr. Coleman states that this is a man-made pond the depth of which is between 8 and 10 feet. There is approximately 3 feet of sediment in the pond. Mr. Coleman states that the oxygen levels are very low. Mr. Coleman states that they are proposing routine maintenance. He has provided more extensive analysis for this pond than he has performed on approximately 15 other pond applications. This is straight forward. We are trying to extend the ecological health of the pond. The disturbance will be temporary.

Cynthia states that NYC sent a letter to the Applicant. Has the Applicant sent a response? Mr. Barrett states that they will respond.

There is a discussion about the approval from the other agencies.

Cynthia confirms that the Board agrees on the bridges. Cynthia states that we have not heard further from Joe regarding the pond area being dredged. Joe was waiting to hear feedback from the Board. There is discussion about the Board being convinced why the smaller pond needs to be dredged. Mr. Barrett states that the smaller pond will not be done. There is discussion about the replacement of a pipe in an open channel.

Cynthia refers to Joe's concern about the dredging and states that he should focus on the big pond and modify

his report. Mr. Rossi states the Dubin's do not need to have a reason for the proposed dredging. Cynthia states that there are two schools of thought on how much dredging is appropriate for a viable wetland habitat. Mr. Rossi asks to what extent activities will result in adverse environmental impacts. Mr. Rossi states that it is not an obligation of a landowner to justify the need for the extent of the work. Mr. Rossi states there is a major difference of opinion here. Mr. Rossi states that his team has addressed every comment, and we feel we have Plans ready to go. Cynthia states that the Board is trying to understand the potential impact of dredging more of the pond than needed. Mr. Rossi is not sure a SWPPP is required. There is discussion about the Site Visit which took place in regards to a SWPPP being needed. Roland asks Mr. Rossi why he believes his client would be exempt from a Town SWPPP. Mr. Rossi states that they are proposing route maintenance. This activity will not result in change of grades or line. Cynthia states that creating the pits and draining the soils is not routine maintenance. Mr. Rossi states that dredging the pond is routine maintenance and an essential component of the Site. Cynthia states that if more than 5,000 square feet will be disturbed a SWPPP is required. Cynthia states that we have requested SWPPP's from other Applicants.

There is a discussion about having both Joe Bridges and Frank Annunziata meet with the Project Team. The Board agrees this should be done.

There is a discussion as to whether or not a Chapter 189 Fill Permit will be required. Mr. Barrett states that he did look through Chapter 189 in the Town Code. Cynthia states that the Board has not been told where the final destination of the dredged piles will be. Cynthia states that Lake Hawthorne has been asked to obtain both a Wetlands Permit and a Chapter 189 Fill Permit. There is discussion about waiving the completion of the Chapter 189 Application for Dubin. The Board agrees to do that. Cynthia states that a minor fee will be required. The Board agrees to waive the Public Hearing.

- 4. Baxter Road:** Dave McAdoo (owner – U.S. Chemical Cheese)
Wetlands Permit (location – 193 Baxter Road)

Application Substantially Complete; Consider Waiver of Public Hearing.

Dave McAdoo is here tonight to represent the property owner. He is their Landscape Manager. Cynthia confirms Mr. McAdoo has received a copy of the MDRA Memo. There is discussion about the Board waiving the Public Hearing for this Application. Cynthia states that a letter from Ralph Mackin, the Applicant's Attorney regarding an intent to remove the old well. Mr. McAdoo states that they have not received a response. Mr. McAdoo states that there is an easement. Mr. McAdoo states that the house has a new well. There is discussion about the Board approving the Application conditioned upon an agreement regarding the well. Roland talks about a rescinding agreement if the well is non-functional and a hazard to trespassers. Roland states that there is a process to abandon the agreement. Roland states that Mr. Arons would have to draft a document. It could be a condition of the permit as long as the situation is rectified. The Board discusses waiving the Public Hearing. Gary is not comfortable waiving the Public Hearing. This would be the perfect opportunity to obtain the attention regarding the old well. The Board agrees to set the Public Hearing for January 6, 2010. Cynthia advises Mr. McAdoo to go to the Assessor's Office to obtain the list of adjoining neighbors. Cynthia will prepare the Public Hearing Notice. Cynthia suggests a Notice be sent to Attorney Mackin as well. Cynthia states that if it is determined the Public Hearing may be closed on January 6th, the Board will go ahead with a Resolution. Cynthia asks Mr. McAdoo if he has any questions regarding the MDRA Memo. Mr. McAdoo has a concern with the timing of the planting recommendations listed in the Memo. Mr. McAdoo is hoping to have most of the work done during the winter months with the exception of the planting. Mr. McAdoo talks about dividing the skunk cabbage. Mr. McAdoo will modify his Plan drawings.

5. Minutes:

- September 16, 2009
- October 7, 2009
- October 21, 2009
- October 29, 2009 (Joint Meeting)

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Approve the Minutes of September 16, 2009. Bernard Sweeney seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Approve the Minutes of October 7, 2009 and October 21, 2009. Gary Jacobi seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Approve the Minutes of the October 29, 2009 Joint Meeting Regarding Fuelco. Gary Jacobi seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

6. Financial Report:

- November, 2009

Chairwoman motions that the Planning Board Approve the November, 2009 Financial Report. Robert Tompkins seconds. All in favor. No opposed.

7. Next Meetings:

- Work Session – December 16, 2009 – canceled
- Regular Meeting – January 6, 2010

8. Comments from the Chair:

Cynthia states that a request has come in from Salem Golf Club proposing to not install previously approved patio lights. Instead they are requesting the addition of low wattage lighting on four trees. Cynthia will review the materials and determine if it may be set up as a Waiver of Site Development Plan Approval.

Regarding the Wetlands Law, Bruce will be given a revised draft in order to provide the Board with comments.

9. Resolution:

Chairwoman motions to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Bernard Sweeney seconds. All in favor. No opposed.